

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 27-30 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 24 and 28-30 are amended, and claims 25 and 26 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1 and 6 are amended to remove typographical errors, which is considered to be a non-narrowing amendment. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 5, 10, 15 and 24 are independent.

Applicant again acknowledges with appreciation that claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-23 are allowed, and claims 26 and 28-30 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 10, 15, 24 and 27 are also allowable in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

TELEPHONIC EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a telephonic interviews on July 23, 2004 and October 25, 2004. During the July, 23, 2004 interview, Applicant's representative requested the interview to clarify the language found in allowable claims 1 and 11, and to determine the Examiner's reasons for allowance. In particular, Applicant's representative stated to the Examiner that the "second transmission step", (i.e., "and so that said first and second information are transmitted in different time slots in each of said time groups") found in claims 1 and 11 appear to be redundant as this feature is previously recited in the same paragraph, and asserted that this feature is not required for allowability. The Examiner agreed but indicated that the recited "second transmission step" appears suitable for claims 1 and 11 without giving an explicit explanation. However, the Examiner indicated that incorporating the "second transmission step" would not be necessary to place the application in

condition for allowance for independent claims 5, 10, 15 and 24. Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 5, 10, 15 and 24 to include the indicated allowable subject matter of “allocating” without the second “transmitting step”, as discussed and agreed during the interview.

During the October 25, 2004 interview, Applicant’s representative discussed in detail the Advisory Action mailed on October 19, 2004. In particular, Applicant’s representative asserted that incorporating the subject matter of claim 25 into independent claim 24 is not required for placing independent claim 24 in condition for allowance. However, Examiner Ng was unresponsive to Applicant’s assertion and stated that the combination of claims 25 and 26 into independent claim 24 would place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, in the effort to expedite receiving a Notice of Allowability, this Amendment cancels claim 25 and incorporates the subject matter into claim 24 as requested by the Examiner. Thus, claim 24 is also now in condition for allowance, as suggested by the Examiner.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Entry of this amendment is requested under 37 CFR § 1.116 because the amendment: a) has placed the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any issues requiring further search or consideration; c) does not present any additional claims; and/or d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC §102

Claims 5, 15, 24, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Barany et al. (herein after “Barany”), U.S. Patent No. 6,594,252.

By this amendment, independent claims 5 and 15 have been amended to include the subject matter indicated allowable in claims 1 and 11. In particular, claims 5 and 15 now include the steps of “arranging the multiframe structures in time groups” and “allocating a priority of time slots in each of the time groups”. Thus, claims 5 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Independent claim 24 is also in condition for allowance as claim 24 includes the allowable subject matter of canceled claims 25 and 26. Claim 27 depends from allowable claim 24. Thus, as all claims have been placed in allowable form, the rejection is now moot.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Marks, U.S. Patent No. 6,178,185. Claim 10 has also been amended to include the allowable subject matter as indicated in claims 1 and 11. Thus, claim 10 is also a condition for allowance. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION


Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-24 and 27-30 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By 

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/MJL/DJC